DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 493 32 EA 003 729

TITLE State Annual Evaluation Report for 1969-70: Title I Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 Public Law 89-10, as Amended.

INSTITUTION Montana State Dept. of Public Instruction, Helena.

PUB DATE Jan 71

NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results

IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Montana

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence and (2) applicable suplementary or background information. Data were collected from the Montana State Department of Public Instruction; teachers, administrators, and State ESEA Title I personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. A related document is EA 003 740. (EA)

ED053493

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT FOR 1969-70 TITLE I ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 PUBLIC LAW 89-10, AS AMENDED

JANUARY 1971

State of Montana
Office of the Superintendent
of Public Instruction
Dolores Colburg, Superintendent
Helena 59601

EA 003 729

PREFACE

An annual evaluation of Montana's ESEA Title I programs is required by federal law. The State Superintendent's Title I staff has the responsibility for evaluating programs and disseminating information to school officials and other interested parties about projects and programs designed to strengthen the education of educationally deprived children.

This report contains a summary of data and information compiled from Title I programs operated by school districts for educationally deprived children regularly enrolled in school. Specialized programs conducted for children of migratory agricultural workers and for handicapped, neglected and delinquent children residing in state supported institutions are described in separate reports.

Major responsibility for the preparation of this report was assumed by Dean M. Lindahl, Supervisor, ESEA Title I, with the assistance of Donald Campbell, Theodore Clark and Jeanine Gilmartin, Ph.D., ESEA Title I Program Specialists, and Mrs. Violet Kelley, ESEA Title I Fiscal Administrator.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
BASIC STATISTICAL DATA	1
ESEA TITLE I STAFF VISITS	8
Planning	8
Review	9
Miscellaneous	9
DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES MADE TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TITLE I PROJECTS	10
PARTICIPATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN	11
CHANGES MADE TO MODIFY PROJECTS IN LIGHT OF STATE AND LOCAL EVALUATION	12
EFFECT UPON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT	14
The Impact on Reading Achievement Levels of Educationally Deprived Children	14
Common Characteristics of Effective Title I Projects	14
Effectiveness of Title I as Related to Cost	15
EFFECT OF TITLE I PROJECTS ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES	16
ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED	17
State Funds Used to Augment Title I Projects	17
Coordination of Title I With Other Federally Funded Programs	17
SUCCESS OF TITLE I IN BRINGING COMPENSATORY EDUCATION TO CHILDREN IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS	18
COORDINATED TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING PROGRAMS	19
COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT	20

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	ESEA Title I Grant and Approved Amounts for School Districts and State Institutions.	1
II	Number of Districts in Title I Projects and Number of Projects in Each Category.	3
III	Summary of ESEA Title I District, Project, Pupil and Staff Participation	4
IV	Number and Percent Distribution of Title I Projects with Accumulative Percentage and Dollar Amount and Percent Distribution of Title I Project Approved Amounts with Accumulated Percentage	6
V	Grade Distribution of Title I Participants by Type School	7

BASIC STATISTICAL DATA

During the fifth year of Title I operation in Montana, 141 projects totaling $2,704,158 were approved to assist school districts and state institutions for the handicapped, neglected and delinquent with special educational programs. The data in Table I show that the total funds approved for this purpose constituted 89.18 percent of the total grant of $3,032,006. Montana's six institutions for the handicapped, neglected and delinquent applied for and were given approval for receipt of all but $3,547 of the $278,118 grant available and Montana's school districts applied for and were given approval for receipt of 88.39 percent of the total grant available.

TABLE I

ESEA TITLE I GRANT AND APPROVED AMOUNTS FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND STATE INSTITUTIONS

	Grant Amount	Approved Project Amount	Percentage
School Districts	$2,753,888	$2,429,587	88.39
State Institutions for the Handicapped	183,249	179,702	98.06
State Institutions for the Neglected	29,357	29,357	100.00
State Institutions for the Delinquent	65,512	65,512	100.00
Totals	$3,032,006	$2,704,158	89.18

In Montana, each public school district is eligible for and is entitled to receive an ESEA Title I allocation. Montana has many rural

districts with small school enrollments as well as a small number of persons aged five through 17 residing in the district. A review of Montana elementary school districts reveals that 45 percent of all elementary schools are one-teacher schools (32 percent) and two-teacher schools (13 percent) with a range in enrollment from one pupil to less than 50 pupils. Consequently, these districts have small allocations, the smallest being $13. Only about one out of five Montana school districts has an allocation greater than the $2,500 minimum amount established to assure a project of size, scope and quality as outlined in Section 116.18 of the Federal Regulations. As a result many districts, especially those in the more isolated areas of Montana, must combine their allocations in a cooperative project in order to qualify for Title I funds. The data in Table II show that there were only 23 single district projects during FY '70 and that 53 percent of the remaining 112 projects were cooperative projects involving two districts. The greatest number of districts in any one project was found in a cooperative project involving 20 districts with a total project approved amount of $8,863 and 54 participants. The average number of districts in a cooperative project was three.

The data in Table III show that 460 or 59 percent of the 779 Montana districts participated in a Title I project during FY '70. Of these participating districts, 131 were high school districts and 329 were elementary districts. The table further reveals that 79 percent of all high school districts and 54 percent of all elementary districts were involved in a Title I project. This table also shows that all six Montana institutions for the handicapped, neglected and delinquent

TABLE II

NUMBER OF DISTRICTS IN TITLE I PROJECTS AND
NUMBER OF PROJECTS IN EACH CATEGORY

Number of Districts in Title I Projects	Total Number of Projects
1	23
2	59
3	17
4	8
5	2
6	9
7	4
8	4
9	1
10	1
11	3
12	1
13	1
16	1
20	1

TABLE III

SUMMARY OF ESEA TITLE I
DISTRICT, PROJECT, PUPIL AND STAFF PARTICIPATION

FISCAL YEAR 1970

1.	Number of School Districts in State		779
	a. Number of high school districts	166	
	b. Number of elementary districts	613	
2.	Number and percent of School Districts in Title I Projects		460 (59%)
	a. Number and percent of high school districts	131 (79%)	
	b. Number and percent of elementary districts	329 (54%)	
3.	Total Number of ESEA Title I Projects		135
	a. Regular school term projects	88 (65%)	
	b. Regular school term and summer projects	23 (18%)	
	c. Summer projects only	24 (17%)	
4.	Total Number of Single District Projects		23
5.	Total Number of Cooperative District Projects		112
6.	Total Number of Pupil Participants		7,420
	a. Number and percent of public school participants	6,803 (92%)	
	b. Number and percent of non-public school participants	423 (6%)	
	c. Number and percent of "youth not enrolled"	194 (2%)	
7.	Number of Regular School Term Salaried Staff Members*		964
	a. Number of regular school term full-time equivalencies (FTE)	405.8	
8.	Number of Summer Term Salaried Staff Members*		738
	a. Number of summer term full-time equivalencies (FTE)	541	
9.	Number of State Institutions in Title I Projects		6

*Data from approved ESEA Title I applications

filed applications for Title I funds and participated in projects designed to assist the disadvantaged children assigned to the institution. These institutions had approved project amounts totaling almost $275,000. (Table I, Page 1)

The data in Table IV show the number and percent distribution of Title I projects as well as the dollar amount and percent distribution of Title I funds. This table reveals that almost one-fourth (23 percent) of all projects approved during FY '70 had approved project amounts in the category of $2,500 to $4,999 and that the total approved amounts for such projects constituted less than five percent (4.7 percent) of the total amount approved. The greatest amount of funds, $546,895 or 22.5 percent, was approved for 19 projects in the $20,000 to $39,999 category. This table also reveals that 123 projects or 91 percent of the Title I projects approved for local educational agencies had project amounts totaling less than $40,000 each and that the total funds for these projects amounted to only 57 percent of the total amount approved.

The data in Table V show that of a total of 7,420 Title I participants, 6,803 or 92 percent were public school children, 423 or six percent were non-public school children, and 194 or two percent were youth not enrolled in school. The persons completing the information for the evaluation instrument were asked to include dropouts who participated in the Title I program in the "youth not enrolled" column and it appears that some respondents considered pre-school children not yet of the age to be included in the state equalization aid program to be "youth not enrolled". This data compares to 88 percent public school participants, nine percent non-public school participants and three percent "youth not enrolled"

TABLE IV

NUMBER AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE I PROJECTS WITH ACCUMULATIVE PERCENTAGE AND DOLLAR AMOUNT AND PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE I PROJECT APPROVED AMOUNTS WITH ACCUMULATED PERCENTAGES

FISCAL YEAR 1970

Approved Project Amounts	Number of Projects	Percent of Projects Each Category	Accumu-lative Percentages	Approved Project Amounts Each Category	Percent Approved Project Amounts Each Category	Accumulative Percentages
$200,000 & Up	2	1.48	100.00	$421,878	17.36	100.00
100,000 to 199,999	1	0.74	98.52	106,642	4.39	82.64
80,000 to 99,999	0	0	0	0	0	0
60,000 to 79,999	3	2.23	97.78	208,404	8.59	78.25
40,000 to 59,999	6	4.45	95.55	304,787	12.54	69.66
20,000 to 39,999	19	14.07	91.10	546,895	22.51	57.12
10,000 to 19,999	28	20.74	77.03	407,100	16.76	34.61
5,000 to 9,999	45	33.33	56.29	317,892	13.08	17.85
2,500 to 4,999	31	22.96	23.12	115,989	4.77	4.77

TABLE V

GRADE DISTRIBUTION OF TITLE I
PARTICIPANTS BY TYPE SCHOOL

Grade Level (1)	Public School Children (2)	Non-Public School Children (3)	Youth Not Enrolled In Any School (4)	Total Participants (Cols. 2+3+4) (5)
Pre-Kindergarten	15	0	99	114
Kindergarten	376	17	47	440
Grade 1	361	24		385
Grade 2	503	38		541
Grade 3	583	50		633
Grade 4	692	69		761
Grade 5	649	43		692
Grade 6	639	39		678
Grade 7	548	26		575
Grade 8	556	26	1	582
Ungraded (Elementary)	271	2		273
Grade 9	531	36	2	569
Grade 10	447	24		471
Grade 11	310	17	2	329
Grade 12	217	12	6	235
Ungraded (High School)	105		37	142
Total	6,803	423	194	7,420

participants during FY '68 and 83 percent public school participants, 12 percent non-public school participants and five percent "youth not enrolled" participants during FY '69. Further, the total number of participants, 20,477 in FY '68, was reduced by 41 percent in FY '69 to 12,081 and in FY '70 the number of participants was reduced by 38 percent to 7,420. The average approved expenditure per participant from Title I funds increased by $85 or 59 percent from $143 per participant in FY '68 to $228 per participant in FY '69. The average approved expenditure per participant from Title I funds again increased by $99 or 43 percent from $228 per participant in FY '69 to $327 per participant in FY '70. This may indicate that projects are more carefully planned and services are concentrated on a limited number of disadvantaged children, thus, adhering more closely to the guidelines and the intent of the Act.

ESEA TITLE I STAFF VISITS

During FY '70 the ESEA Title I staff made 197 visits to districts participating in Title I. These staff visits can be categorized by objective as follows: 1) Planning, 2) Review and 3) Miscellaneous.

Planning

Of the 197 staff visits 29 or 15 percent were primarily devoted to assisting the school officials and their staff to plan effective projects. Through these visits the ESEA Title I staff assisted the local staff in such areas as identifying pupil needs, defining project objectives, determining appropriate activities to reach those objectives and selecting alternatives which offer greater promise of helping the disadvantaged child.

In addition to these visits the ESEA Title I staff provided leadership and consultative services to school officials, project directors, authorized representatives and project supervisors who visited the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to secure help in project planning.

Review

Of the 197 staff visits 158 or 80 percent were on-site reviews of Title I projects. During the visit all phases of the program (planning, program development, program operation, evaluation and fiscal control) were considered and discussed. Each visit was specifically designed to assess the manner and degree to which the districts were implementing and operating the program as approved by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

Miscellaneous

Of the 197 staff visits 10 or 15 percent were not easily classified in any one category. These included such activities as ESEA Title I staff attendance at various administrator conferences and education conventions. Although attendance at these conferences and conventions was not primarily for the purpose of discussing Title I, much groundwork for the development of future programs was developed along with discussing and providing assistance in special problem areas. It is believed that, although not considered planning sessions, these visits did result in more formal planning of new and/or revised activities.

DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES MADE TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TITLE I PROJECTS

In an effort to improve the quality of Title I projects, to better serve the school districts and to facilitate the operation of Title I, the Superintendent of Public Instruction divided the state into three regions with an ESEA Title I program specialist assigned to represent each region. Each region is composed of 18 or 20 counties and about an equal number of projects. The addition to the ESEA Title I staff of three program specialists, each representing one of three regions, has increased on-site visitations, thus providing more assistance to school officials in the areas of program planning, implementation, operation and evaluation. From the basis of experience of the first two or three years of Title I operation, it was determined that the same program specialist should work with the same school official throughout the year in project development and project implementation. Previously, the school official may have dealt with a different staff member each time a new project, or an amendment or a budget change was made.

As a part of his responsibilities, each program specialist visits each project in the region he represents. During the on-site visit the program specialist compares the approved project proposal with the operation of the project and reviews the efforts made by the school district to attain the objectives of the project. He notes and points out to the superintendent of schools and the Title I project directors or supervisors the strengths or weaknesses that he has observed. He makes short-term and long-term suggestions relative to the project. He also has the opportunity to share ideas with the Title I personnel that he may have gleaned from visits to other projects. As a result of the assignment

of an ESEA Title I program specialist to each region of the state, the school officials now feel that they have more direct contact with the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and have found that this personal contact is useful both to them and the Superintendent's staff. All of this has resulted in an improvement of the quality of the approved Title I projects. The ESEA Title I program specialist has gained sophistication in screening the applications received from the school districts. This has had the effect of narrowing the thrust of Title I and of concentrating on a fewer number of children. Another effect has been for the school officials to think in terms of individualizing the educational programs for Title I children.

A newsletter entitled Timberline was developed and three issues were mailed to all persons participating in Title I programs. The purpose of the newsletter is to provide a vehicle for the dissemination of information about Title I projects.

In addition to a newsletter, a synopsis of all Title I projects during 1970 was prepared and distributed to school officials and Title I administrative personnel.

During FY '70 a Research, Planning, Development and Evaluation component was added to the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. This component will improve the evaluation procedures used in all phases of education in Montana and certainly will assist Title I in its efforts to improve planning and evaluation of Title I projects.

PARTICIPATION OF NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL CHILDREN

To insure proper participation of non-public school children, a

routine cross-check is made at the time the application is submitted by the district official. If the school district has a non-public school located within its boundaries, the application must contain a signed, dated statement of evidence of program activities for disadvantaged children from the non-public school or a signed, dated statement from the non-public school administrator that their disadvantaged children will not participate in the project. The district's Title I administrator has been charged with the responsibility of conferring with the non-public school officials in their district to explain the Title I program and encourage participation to the extent permitted under the Act.

Data from evaluation reports submitted to the Superintendent of Public Instruction by Title I administrators show that in the majority of the cases cooperation between the officials of public and non-public schools was established without encountering any serious problems. However, the reports show that in a few instances difficulty was experienced in determining the needs of non-public school children, in scheduling and avoiding time conflicts of activities and in establishing transportation service between the non-public school and the project site.

CHANGES MADE TO MODIFY PROJECTS IN LIGHT OF STATE AND LOCAL EVALUATION

ESEA Title I program specialists make on-site visits to most of the projects in Montana. A formal written report follows the visitation.

At the time of the visit by the ESEA Title I program specialist the strong and weak points of a Title I project are assessed. Constructive criticism is given and should it appear that federal guidelines are not being followed or that the project is not being operated in accordance

with the approved proposal, more stringent requests are made to bring the program in line with the Title I concepts. Most modifications are minor in nature.

During the past three or four years the project directors and supervisors have been encouraged to use more testing to secure hard data and to rely less on subjective judgement. They have also been encouraged to consult with professional educators and other specialists in educational research regarding the design and implementation of a well balanced evaluation program. The effects of these efforts are difficult to isolate; however, the quality of project applications has steadily improved over the past three years.

Special emphasis has been placed on identifying educationally disadvantaged children and on determining the priority needs of these children rather than the needs of the general program of the school system. This has resulted in programs being better suited to the individual needs of the eligible children and in more comprehensive services being provided identified children. Concentration on comprehensive needs of educationally disadvantaged children has also led to better coordination of services provided by various other local, state and federal agencies providing assistance for these same children.

The project directors and supervisors have been encouraged to write specific measurable objectives and plans for evaluating each measurable objective, to evaluate periodically and to carefully diagnose the evaluation results of their activities. Occasionally it has been necessary to change teaching techniques or to revise certain aspects of the program in order to reach the desired objectives. On one or two

occasions it was necessary to change the program and use another approach in order to achieve the predetermined goals.

EFFECT UPON EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

The Impact on Reading Achievement Levels of Educationally Deprived Children

Montana does not have a statewide testing program or a testing service. Standardized aptitude or scholastic achievement tests are not furnished by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction nor does the Office have the authority to recommend the selection of or to discourage the use of any particular kind or type of test.

Each school district designs its testing program using as its guide the philosophy of the administrative staff, the guidance counselor, the personnel director or the school psychologist, psychiatrist or psychometrist and, of course, the amount of funds and time available.

In view of this, the Superintendent of Public Instruction cannot provide objective statewide evidence, standardized test results, comparative data with state or national norms or statewide assessment of the impact of Title I on project participants or a comparison of the achievement of project participants with that of non-Title I pupils. As a result it is difficult to make a comprehensive and statistically accurate study of educational achievement of Title I participants.

Common Characteristics of Effective Title I Projects

Projects in Montana used a wide variety of approaches in attempting to ameliorate the problems of the disadvantaged child. While nearly all the evaluation reports from school officials indicated varying degrees

of success, those projects which appeared to be the most successful were the ones which provided individual attention for the disadvantaged child; which were carefully planned to achieve a limited number of objectives; which had developmental goals rather than remedial goals; which alerted school personnel to the needs of the disadvantaged children and aroused sympathy for those needs; which provided in-service training to prepare the teacher and paraprofessionals for their assigned tasks; which were designed to provide programs utilizing the services of social workers, consultants, psychologists, health personnel, guidance personnel for the elementary pupils, paraprofessionals and additional instructional personnel; and which had more effective utilization of hardware. It would seem that the pupil receives the most help when he has an individual claim for the attention of an adult. Therefore, a well balanced program which provides for the disadvantaged child's educational, physical, cultural and emotional needs is the most successful.

Effectiveness of Title I as Related to Cost

There are no data available in Montana to either prove or disprove that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to expenditure of funds. Certainly any time the teacher-pupil ratio is lowered, education will cost more. Individualized instruction is one of the most effective components contributing to success of a Title I project. From subjective analysis of evaluation reports submitted by the school officials, there seems to be a positive relationship between per pupil cost and project effectiveness.

EFFECT OF TITLE I PROJECTS ON THE ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE AND EDUCATIONAL PRACTICES

In February of 1970 the State Superintendent reorganized her staff and placed the ESEA Title I program in the Development of Basic Skills component. The ESEA Title I staff consists of a supervisor, three program specialists, a fiscal administrator and three secretaries. The ESEA Title I supervisor is responsible for all the activities of Title I within the state. Each of the three program specialists is responsible for the planning, development, implementation, operation and evaluation of the programs in his assigned region. The three program specialists are responsible for assisting school district officials in the planning, designing, implementation, operation and evaluation of the Title I programs. The fiscal administrator is responsible for monitoring the financial transaction records of all the projects within the state as well as preparing the quarterly and annual financial reports for the Office of Education. The three secretaries are responsible for typing project approvals, correspondence and maintaining project files.

One unique feature of the Title I staff is its ability to move across program lines within the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. Because of the broad range of Title I program activities that are submitted for approval by school officials, the personnel on the Superintendent's staff are called upon many times for their advice, consultation, expertise and guidance. This has led to strengthening Title I programs for disadvantaged children.

With respect to changes in the administrative structure and the educational practices of school districts, the ESEA Title I program

specialist has encouraged school officials to assign personnel to supervise the Title I program and to grant the supervisor adequate time to do an effective job. Also, the program specialist has encouraged the hiring of specialized personnel in the areas of guidance, health and social work. In-service training programs, wherein Title I staff as well as all school personnel may become aware of and familiar with the needs of the disadvantaged child, were suggested for most project applications.

Although the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has no concrete evidence of changes in the administrative structure and the educational practices of non-public schools, it appears that Title I has had some effect on the educational practices as observed through an increased use of teacher aides and instructional equipment. There seems to be more communication between public school and non-public school personnel since the advent of Title I.

ADDITIONAL EFFORTS TO HELP THE DISADVANTAGED

State Funds Used to Augment Title I Projects

There are no legal provisions in Montana law for earmarked state funds to be used to augment or supplement Title I project funds. Consequently, this item is not applicable.

Coordination of Title I With Other Federally Funded Programs

Title I must be a part of a total system of education. A Title I project for disadvantaged children, to be completely effective, cannot be an entity of its own nor can it be divorced from the mainstream of education.

There was considerable visual evidence of the titles of ESEA

complementing one another as well as funds and services from other local, state or federal programs, or agencies being used in cooperation with Title I.

In responding to the evaluation questionnaire, 26 projects indicated that there had been an interrelationship of ESEA Title I with Title II of ESEA and that this interrelationship took the form primarily of using library books purchased with Title II funds in Title I projects. Eight projects used the services of Title III of ESEA and one project used services furnished by Title VI-A.

Services of other federal programs or agencies were used in cooperation with Title I projects. In eight projects the services of the U. S. Department of Agriculture Food Program provided milk and/or lunch for project participants who were financially in need of such assistance.

In four projects the Education Professions Development Act assisted in providing training for Title I personnel. In two projects the Title I program and Headstart program complemented each other and in two projects Title I funds were used to assist in the support of follow-through as provided by law.

State social and welfare agencies provided an extremely important service in ten projects by furnishing assistance to the project directors in surveying and identifying pupil needs and selecting pupil participants in Title I projects.

SUCCESS OF TITLE I IN BRINGING COMPENSATORY EDUCATION TO CHILDREN IN NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Cooperation and participation between public and non-public schools in Montana has been excellent. In most instances the authorized

representative, the board of trustees or the project director conferred with officials of non-public schools for the purpose of project planning. Each ESEA Title I program specialist has emphasized, when in consultation with public school officials, that non-public officials should be involved early in program planning so that the benefits of their contributions could be included in the project. The program specialist did not actually arrange for any meetings between public and non-public school officials; however, the program specialist, while reviewing an application submitted by districts in which non-public schools were located, made certain that non-public school officials had agreed to participate or not to participate, as the case may be. Non-public school children participated in a total of 24 Title I projects.

Participation or nonparticipation of non-public school children in Title I projects has never been challenged by any person or group. Consequently, there has been no litigation or any reason for any legal interpretation or changes in interpretation of the law or federal regulation. As mentioned before, cooperation between the two school systems has been excellent.

COORDINATED TEACHER-TEACHER AIDE TRAINING PROGRAMS

Almost all projects indicated some effort had been made to provide some pre-service and in-service training. The type of activity or training included preliminary meetings, reading conferences and reading clinics, institutes, orientation programs, consultants, brainstorming sessions, visitation to other projects, workshops and staff meetings.

The coordinated in-service training programs are strongly recommended by the program specialist as a condition for application approval.

All projects in which teacher aides were to be used were encouraged to develop a training program, one in which the aides and teachers they were to assist participated together. Suggested topics for in-service training programs included the education of the disadvantaged child, early childhood education, the psychology of the disadvantaged child, culture of the educationally disadvantaged child, types of learning disabilities, orientation to Title I programs, program planning and design, measurement evaluation and reporting and the duties of the teacher aides.

Both the pre-service and in-service training of teachers and teacher aides proved invaluable. The training assisted the staff in gaining a more thorough insight into the educational, academic, social, emotional and behavioral problems of the learner.

COMMUNITY AND PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT

During the first two or three years of Title I, little was done to involve parents in the planning or operation of Title I programs. However, as a concept of parental involvement began to take hold, many schools found that the success of the programs, as well as the success of each individual participant, was directly related to the involvement and cooperation of the parents.

The ESEA Title I staff has long encouraged school officials to involve the parents and the community actively in the planning and operation of a Title I project.

ESEA Title I specialists have encouraged project supervisors to include in their project specific activities and services for parents which are related to the needs of their children. Types of activities or services which are made available to parents are: school social work services, home

contacts by members of the Title I staff, parental discussion groups, inclusion of parents in school activities as paid or unpaid volunteers, placement of appropriate materials in the home that parents may use to assist their children, orientation sessions to help parents become familiar with equipment and materials their children use in school, as well as other activities which may be desirable in order that the parents may relate to their child's participation in project and school activities.

In a total of 23 projects, the Community Action Agency was involved in various phases of project planning. In nine projects, the Community Action Agency assisted in locating and identifying children who were to participate in project activities. In three projects, the Community Action Agency assisted in recruiting staff, and in two projects the agency helped with funding and supplementing the services offered by Title I. In those areas where OEO operated Headstart programs and in those cities having Model City programs, there was cooperation between those agencies and Title I project activity. It appears that community involvement consisted primarily of activity in connection with the Community Action Agency.

Although all projects involved parents to some degree in the form of parent-teacher conferences, only one project was specifically designed to deliberately involve parents on a scheduled program. Parents of children who were to participate in the project were invited to an orientation meeting during which the program was explained in detail, and the psychology of the child of that age group and anticipated behavior of the child in a project situation were discussed. During the operation of the project the parents were scheduled to participate in the activities with their children in the classroom environment. The Title I program

consisted of two phases in which the parents participated: one, a music program during which the parents and their children learned to play a guitar and the other, a ceramic program during which the parents and their children produced together various ceramic articles. The scheduled parental involvement program in music proved so successful that it was necessary to expand the program by 100 percent and the interest among the parents in the ceramic program has increased to the point that present facilities are inadequate.